

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/350,713	07/09/1999	JOSEPH B. KEJHA	JBK-7	8585

7590 09/24/2003

JOSEPH B KEJHA
1022 FREDERICK ROAD
MEADOWBROOK, PA 19046

EXAMINER

VANAMAN, FRANK BENNETT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3618

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/350,713

Applicant(s)

KEJHA, JOSEPH B.

Examiner

Frank Vanaman

Art Unit

3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 9-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-11, 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Status of Application

1. Applicant's request, filed July 11, 2003, has been entered in the application. Claims 1-6 and 9-30 are pending, claims 12-25 having been withdrawn as directed to a non-elected invention. An office action on claims 1-6, 9-11 and 26-30 follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1-6, 11/1, 26, 27/1, 27/3 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, lines 10-11, the recitation appears to contradict the recitation of lines 9-10, similarly in claims 2 and 3, lines 12-13 (both claims) the recitations appear to contradict the recitations of lines 8-9 (both claims), and further it is not entirely clear what particular recited structural distinction results in such a claimed improvement. In claim 5, line 2, the claims from which claim 5 depends lack a clear antecedent basis for a plurality of systems. The claims should be carefully reviewed and revised for clarity. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. Note the format of the claims in the U.S. Patent documents which have been cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable, as best understood, over West (US 3,517,766) in view of Munday (US 5,143,025). West teaches a vehicle riding on 1-4 wheels, having a body, an internal combustion engine which is not sealed from the atmosphere, a pair of generators driven by the engine, a battery connected to the generators and motor, the electric motor connected to both the battery and generators, the motor for driving the vehicle, wherein the vehicle is further provided with a steering system. The reference of West fails to teach the engine as being powered by hydrogen, the hydrogen being obtained through the electrolysis of water from a generating cell, and not stored under pressure, the cell electrically connected to the generators and battery.

Art Unit: 3618

Munday teaches a very low emission (col. 1, lines 1-31) vehicle engine (10) operated on a hydrogen fuel from hydrogen obtained from a hydrogen storage element (16) which directly feeds hydrogen generated by electrolysis of water in a cell (36, 40, note col. 3, lines 5-20), to the engine and does not store the hydrogen under pressure, the cell being electrically connected (58, 64) to a source of electricity. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the engine and fuel source of the vehicle of West with a hydrogen engine and fuel supply as taught by Munday for the purpose of greatly reducing vehicle emissions, as specifically taught by Munday, resulting in a vehicle having a longer range, as best understood, than a vehicle having constituent drive elements of smaller capacity.

The reference of Munday fails to specifically teach that the electric supply be from both a generator and a battery, however, in view of the vehicle of West featuring both a battery and a pair of generators, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow selective connection of the generating cell of Munday to either electricity source (i.e., the battery and/or generators), for the purpose of allowing the cell to be operative under circumstances wherein one or the other of the sources is not in operation.

5. Claims 4/1 and 4/3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over West in view of Munday and Hart (US 4,124,741). The references of West and Munday are discussed above and fail to teach a hydrogen storage portion which contains carbon graphite. Hart teaches that it is well known to use carbon graphite to store hydrogen (e.g., abstract, and col.3, lines 27-34) due to its advantageous properties, as discussed by Hart. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the storage element of the vehicle of West as modified by Munday with a carbon graphite material for the purposes of enhancing the storage of Hydrogen and improving the operation of the vehicle.

6. Claims 5/1 and 5/3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over West in view of Munday and Meinzer (US 5,360,461). The references of West and Munday are discussed above and fail to teach a hydrogen storage portion which contains a metal hydride. Meinzer teaches that it is well known to use a metal hydride

Art Unit: 3618

(8) to store hydrogen (col. 4, lines 37-38) as such a material allows high density storage. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the storage element of the vehicle of West as modified by Munday with a metal hydride material as taught by Meinzer for the purposes of increasing the amount of hydrogen which may be stored, improving the operation of the vehicle.

7. Claims 6/1 and 6/3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over West in view of Munday, Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al. (US 4,985,184). The references of West and Munday and Hart are discussed above (with respect to claims 4/1 and 4/3) and fail to teach a hydrogen storage portion which additionally contains a metal hydride. Meinzer teaches that it is well known to use a metal hydride (8) to store hydrogen (col. 4, lines 37-38) as such a material allows high density storage. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the storage element of the vehicle of West as modified by Munday and Hart with an additional metal hydride material as taught by Meinzer for the purposes of increasing the amount of hydrogen which may be stored, improving the operation of the vehicle. As regards the provision of mesocarbon microbeads, while the references of Hart and Meinzer fail to specifically teach the use of such a material, Takahashi et al. teach the use of mesocarbon microbeads (col. 7, lines 11-30) in the production of a carbon element, to assist in the molding thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a portion of the hydrogen storage portion to employ mesocarbon microbeads as taught by Takahashi et al. for the purpose of assisting in the molding of a desired form of the storage element.

8. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werth (US 5,840,270, filed 06/1995; 04/1993) in view of Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al. Werth teaches an electric vehicle construction including an electric motor (11), battery (24), electricity generating fuel cell (12), which both powers the motor and charges the battery. The reference of Werth fails to teach a hydrogen storage element including carbon graphite. Hart teaches that it is well known to use carbon graphite to store hydrogen due to its advantageous properties, as discussed by Hart. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a

Art Unit: 3618

hydrogen storage element containing carbon graphite, as taught by Hart, for the purpose of providing a means to store additionally generated hydrogen generated by the generation system of Werth, in order to provide a residual amount of hydrogen to run the fuel cell.

The references of Werth and Hart are discussed above and fail to teach a hydrogen storage portion which additionally contains a metal hydride. Meinzer teaches that it is well known to use a metal hydride to store hydrogen as such a material allows high density storage. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the storage element of the vehicle of Werth as modified by Hart with an additional metal hydride material as taught by Meinzer for the purposes of increasing the amount of hydrogen which may be stored, improving the operation of the vehicle. The references of Werth, Hart and Meinzer fail to teach the specific use of mesocarbon microbeads. Takahashi et al. teach the use of mesocarbon microbeads (col. 7, lines 11-30) in the production of a carbon element, to assist in the molding thereof. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a portion of the hydrogen storage portion to employ mesocarbon microbeads as taught by Takahashi et al. for the purpose of assisting in the molding of a desired form of the storage element.

As regards the provision of a body which carries a passenger, at least two running wheels and a steering system, the examiner hereby takes Official Notice that these three features are very old and well known in the art of vehicle manufacture, and it is not deemed beyond the skill of the average practitioner in the art to provide a body which accommodates at least one passenger, at least two running wheels and a steering system for the purpose of providing a vehicle which will safely convey passengers from one destination to another.

9. Claims 11/1 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over West in view of Munday and Tangri (US 4,085,709). The references of West and Munday are discussed above and fail to teach the electrolyzer as being powered by a source of electricity exterior of the vehicle. Tangri teaches a power system for a vehicle which includes an electrolyzer, wherein the electrolyzer may be operated, for example

Art Unit: 3618

when the vehicle is at rest (col. 3, lines 4-15), by electrical power from an external source (through 24, 26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a means for allowing the electrolyzer of West as modified by Munday to be operated from an external power source as taught by Tangri for the purpose of allowing the electrolyzer to operate without draining a vehicle battery.

10. Claims 11/9 and 11/10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werth in view of Hart, Meinzer, Takahashi et al. and Tangri (US 4,085,709). The references of Werth, Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al. are discussed above and fail to teach a hydrogen electrolyzer which may be powered from an external power source. Tangri teaches a power system for a vehicle which includes an electrolyzer for producing hydrogen, wherein the electrolyzer may be operated, for example when the vehicle is at rest (col. 3, lines 4-15), by electrical power from an external source (through 24, 26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an electrolyzer as taught by Tangri to the vehicle of Werth as modified by Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al. for the purpose of allowing a quantity of hydrogen to be generated without requiring the provision of the material handling (i.e., the iron or iron pellets) taught by Werth as modified by Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al., and further it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide means for allowing the electrolyzer of Werth as modified by Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al. to be operated from an external power source as taught by Tangri for the purpose of allowing the electrolyzer to operate without draining a vehicle battery.

11. Claims 26/1, 26/2, and 26/3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over West in view of Munday and Laumann et al. (US 4,112,875). The references of West and Munday are discussed above and fail to teach the return of cooled exhaust gasses from the engine back to the intake through a connecting means. Laumann et al. teaches a hydrogen fuel system for an internal combustion engine wherein the exhaust gasses from an output (62) are cooled (64) and partially returned (69) through a connecting means (50) to the engine intake (44/46), for the purpose of reusing uncombusted hydrogen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 3618

the art at the time of the invention to provide a return to the engine of West as modified by Munday which returns cooled exhaust from the engine output to the engine intake as taught by Laumann et al. for the purpose of insuring that all hydrogen is combusted, thus reducing waste.

12. Claims 27/1 and 27/3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over West in view of Munday, Kerrebrock et al. (US 5,372,617) and Gallagher (US 3,895,102). The references of West and Munday are discussed above and fail to teach the hydrogen as being generated by a hydrogen generating reactor which produces hydrogen in a reaction with sodium borohydride and water. Kerrebrock et al. teaches that the use of sodium borohydride and water is old and well known for generating hydrogen (see table 1, col. 2), and as such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a reactor which generates hydrogen using sodium borohydride and water, as taught by Kerrebrock et al., for the purpose of easily generating hydrogen without using excessive electric power. The modifying reference to Kerrebrock et al. fails to teach the presence of a metal catalyst. Gallagher teaches that it is well known to use metals as catalysts and in addition to control a particular rate of generation of hydrogen in hydrogen generators. See col. 1, lines 8-27, col. 2, lines 26-42, col. 3, lines 57-62; col 4, line 62 through col. 5 line 12; col 5, line 46 through col. 6, line 5, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the reactor taught by Kerrebrock et al. as used to modify the reference of West as modified by Munday with a metal catalyst as suggested by Gallagher for the purpose of controlling a reaction rate.

13. Claims 27/9 and 27/10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werth in view of Hart, Meinzer, Takahashi, et al., Kerrebrock et al. and Gallagher. The references of Werth, Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al. are discussed above and fail to teach a hydrogen electrolyzer which may be powered from an external power source. The hydrogen as being generated by a hydrogen generating reactor which produces hydrogen in a reaction with sodium borohydride and water. Kerrebrock et al. teaches that the use of sodium borohydride and water is old and well known for generating hydrogen (see table 1, col. 2), and as such, it would have been

Art Unit: 3618

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a reactor which generates hydrogen using sodium borohydride and water, as taught by Kerrebrock et al., for the purpose of easily generating hydrogen without requiring substantial treatment of raw materials. The modifying reference to Kerrebrock et al. fails to teach the presence of a metal catalyst. Gallagher teaches that it is well known to use metals as catalysts and in addition to control a particular rate of generation of hydrogen in hydrogen generators. See col. 1, lines 8-27, col. 2, lines 26-42, col. 3, lines 57-62; col 4, line 62 through col. 5 line 12; col 5, line 46 through col. 6, line 5, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the reactor taught by Kerrebrock et al. as used to modify the reference of Werth as modified by Hart, Meinzer and Takahashi et al. with a metal catalyst as suggested by Gallagher for the purpose of controlling a reaction rate.

14. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werth in view of Kerrebrock et al. and Gallagher. Werth teaches an electric vehicle construction including an electric motor (11), battery (24), electricity generating fuel cell (12), which both powers the motor and charges the battery. The reference of Werth fails to teach the hydrogen as being generated by a hydrogen generating reactor which produces hydrogen in a reaction with sodium borohydride and water. Kerrebrock et al. teaches that the use of sodium borohydride and water is old and well known for generating hydrogen (see table 1, col. 2), and as such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a reactor which generates hydrogen using sodium borohydride and water, as taught by Kerrebrock et al., for the purpose of easily generating hydrogen without using excessive electric power. The modifying reference to Kerrebrock et al. fails to teach the presence of a metal catalyst. Gallagher teaches that it is well known to use metals as catalysts and in addition to control a particular rate of generation of hydrogen in hydrogen generators. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the reactor taught by Kerrebrock et al. as used to modify the reference of Werth with a metal catalyst as suggested by Gallagher for the purpose of controlling a reaction rate.

Art Unit: 3618

As regards the provision of a body which carries a passenger, at least two running wheels and a steering system, the examiner hereby takes Official Notice that these three features are very old and well known in the art of vehicle manufacture, and it is not deemed beyond the skill of the average practitioner in the art to provide a body which accommodates at least one passenger, at least two running wheels and a steering system for the purpose of providing a vehicle which will safely convey passengers from one destination to another.

Double Patenting

15. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Applicant's co-pending application 08/950,445 remains unavailable to the examiner, however Double Patenting issues may exist between the claims of the instant application and those of the co-pending application. As the claims of the co-pending application are not patented at this time, any such rejections would be provisional. As the co-pending application becomes available to the examiner, provisional Double Patenting rejections may be applied against the claims of the instant application.

Response to Comments

16. Applicant's comments concerning secondary considerations submitted on July 11, 2003 have been noted. Applicant has not directly addressed these comments to (a) the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, (b) the rejections under 35 USC 103 based on the prior art of record, nor (c) the Double Patenting issues. In view of Applicant's comments, the examiner acknowledges that objective evidence as to the non-obviousness of a claimed invention must be considered. Affidavits or declarations containing evidence of criticality or unexpected results, commercial success, long-felt but unsolved needs, failure of others, skepticism of experts, etc., must be considered by the examiner in determining the issue of obviousness of claims for patentability under 35 U.S.C. 103. The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit stated in *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 1538, 218 USPQ 871, 879 (Fed. Cir. 1983) that "evidence rising out of the so-called 'secondary considerations' must always when present be considered en route to a determination of obviousness." Such evidence might give light to circumstances surrounding the origin of the subject matter sought to be patented. As indicia of obviousness or unobviousness, such evidence may have relevancy. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966); *In re Palmer*, 451 F.2d 1100, 172 USPQ 126 (CCPA 1971); *In re Fielder*, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973). The *Graham v. John Deere* pronouncements on the relevance of commercial success, etc. to a determination of obviousness were not negated in *Sakraida v. Ag Pro*, 425 U.S. 273, 189 USPQ 449 (1979) or *Anderson's-Black Rock Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57, 163 USPQ 673 (1969), where reliance was placed upon *A&P Tea Co. v. Supermarket Corp.*, 340 U.S. 147, 87 USPQ 303 (1950). See *Dann v. Johnston*, 425 U.S. 219, 226 n.4, 189 USPQ 257, 261 n. 4 (1976).

However, for the secondary considerations to be of Probative value, any objective evidence should be supported by actual proof, which it is not, in the instant case. Objective evidence which must be factually supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration to be of probative value includes evidence of unexpected results, commercial success, solution of a long-felt need, inoperability of the prior art, invention before the date of the reference, and allegations that the author(s) of the prior art

Art Unit: 3618

derived the disclosed subject matter from the applicant. See, for example, *In re De Blauwe*, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984) ("It is well settled that unexpected results must be established by factual evidence." "[A]ppellants have not presented any experimental data showing that prior heat-shrinkable articles split. Due to the absence of tests comparing appellant's heat shrinkable articles with those of the closest prior art, we conclude that appellant's assertions of unexpected results constitute mere argument."). See also *In re Lindner*, 457 F.2d 506, 508, 173 USPQ 356, 358 (CCPA 1972); *Ex parte George*, 21 USPQ2d 1058 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1991).

Note that at no time can attorney (or agent's) arguments take the place of evidence in the record. *In re Schulze*, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965). Examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration include statements regarding unexpected results, commercial success, solution of a long-felt need, inoperability of the prior art, invention before the date of the reference, and allegations that the author(s) of the prior art derived the disclosed subject matter from the applicant.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3618

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Vanaman whose telephone number is 703-308-0424. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

As of May 1, 2003, any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,

Or faxed to one of the following fax servers:

Regular Communications/Amendments: 703-872-9326
After Final Amendments: 703-872-9327
Customer Service Communications: 703-872-9325

F. VANAMAN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3618



9/22/03